

HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

AZEB ALEMAYEHU,

Plaintiff,

v.

SEATTLE POLICE DEPARTMENT,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:22-cv-01318-RAJ

ORDER

THIS MATTER comes before the Court on Plaintiff Azeb Alemayehu (“Plaintiff”)’s Motion to Reopen Case, which the Court construes as a motion for reconsideration. Dkt. # 11. For the reasons set forth below, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff’s Motion.

On September 19, 2022, Plaintiff filed a Motion for Leave to Proceed *in Forma Pauperis* (“IFP Application”) proceeding a Proposed Complaint that asserted vague civil rights violations committed by Defendant Seattle Police Department (“Defendant”). Dkt. ## 1, 3. Specifically, Plaintiff alleged that Defendant “forced him to stand naked.” Dkt. # 1 at 6–7. Magistrate Judge S. Kate Vaughan issued a Minute Order denying the IFP Application, noting that Plaintiff did not offer complete and detailed information as to his

1 financial status. Dkt. # 4. She instructed him to file a revised IFP Application within  
2 twenty days, warning him that failure to comply may result in denial of the IFP Application  
3 and dismissal of the case. *Id.* On October 24, 2022, the Court dismissed the matter for  
4 failure to prosecute, as Plaintiff did not adhere to the requisite timeline. Dkt. # 5. Earlier  
5 this year, the Court informed Plaintiff to cease filing documents in this closed case after he  
6 submitted an Application for Court Appointed Counsel. Dkt. # 7. Plaintiff now asks the  
7 Court to reopen the case. Dkt. # 11.

8 Local Civil Rule 7(h) of the Western District of Washington governs motions for  
9 reconsideration. Motions for reconsideration are disfavored, and the court will ordinarily  
10 deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a  
11 showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its attention  
12 earlier with reasonable diligence. LCR 7(h)(1). A motion for reconsideration must be filed  
13 within fourteen days of the order to which it relates is filed. LCR 7(h)(2).

14 The Motion is untimely, as Plaintiff filed it almost three years after the Court issued  
15 its Order dismissing the case. Nonetheless, it lacks merit. Plaintiff offers no specific facts  
16 about his case other than blanket assertions that Defendant is causing injury to him and his  
17 daughter. Dkt. # 11 at 1–2. He cites to no legal authority supporting his position that the  
18 Court should reopen his case. Plaintiff continues to defy the Court’s prior directive to cease  
19 filing documents in this matter.

20 Accordingly, Plaintiff’s Motion to Reopen Case is **DENIED**. Dkt. # 7.

21  
22 Dated this 25th day of June, 2025.

23  
24 

25 The Honorable Richard A. Jones  
26 United States District Judge  
27